

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The foregoing amendments and the remarks that follow are intended to impart precision to the claims, and more particularly point out the invention, rather than to avoid prior art.

Claims 1-25 are pending in the application. Claims 1-21 were rejected. Claims 1, 8 and 15-21 were amended and claims 22-25 were added. No new matter has been added.

CLAIM REJECTION - 35 USC § 102

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-21 under 35 USC §102 as being anticipated by Brewster et al., U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2002/0147847 (hereinafter “*Brewster*”).

Applicant respectfully traverses.

Independent Claim 1

Independent claim 1 recites a “method performed by at least one information handling system, the method comprising:

receiving an excerpt of information at a computing device; and
automatically storing the excerpt, in an XML format, in a folder on a storage medium that is preselected by a first user, wherein the folder is selected from a group consisting of a group folder and a public folder, the group folder is accessible by one or more second users specified by the first user as a group, the public folder is accessible to all users subscribed to the public folder.[”]

Support for the claim amendment can be found in the specification and drawings. (See [para. 0036] and Figure 7).

Brewster is directed to a method for converting data in documents submitted over a network into XML documents (Abstract). “The XML documents are stored in a central location where designated users may convert them into different viewable formats using a multitude of stylesheets, such as XSL stylesheets, thereby allowing display of the same data from a number of different viewpoints” (Abstract).

Brewster fails to disclose, teach or suggest “storing the excerpt … in a folder … that is preselected by a first user.[”] This claim limitation allows a first user to share the information in

the folder with one or more other users accessing the folder. In contrast, the XML document in *Brewster* is first emailed to a recipient administrator and then stored on the server (Figure 2). *Brewster* also fails to disclose, teach or suggest that the XML document is stored in a group folder or a public folder, whereby the group folder is accessible by one or more second users specified by the first user as a group and the public folder is accessible to all users subscribed to the public folder. In fact, the word “folder” was never mentioned in *Brewster*. Hence, *Brewster* fails to satisfy all the claim limitations of independent claim 1. Applicant respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 be withdrawn.

Claims 2-22

Claims 2-7, and 22 depend from claim 1. These claims are patentable for the same reasons advanced with respect to independent claim 1. Independent claims 8 and 15 and their dependent claims are also patentable for the same reasons advanced with respect to independent claim 1.

New Claim 24

New independent claim 24 recites “A method performed by at least one information handling system, the method comprising:

at a computing device, receiving an excerpt of information about one or more websites;

at the computing device, receiving a folder selection from a first user to store the excerpt therein, the folder is selected from a group consisting of a group folder and a public folder, the group folder is accessible to one or more second users specified by the first user as a group, the public folder is accessible to any user subscribed to the public folder; and

automatically storing the excerpt in the folder on a storage medium selected by the first user.”

Support for the new claim can be found in the specification and drawings. (See [para. 0036] and Figures 4A-I).

Brewster fails to disclose, teach or suggest “receiving a folder selection from a first user” wherein the folder is “selected from a group consisting of a public folder and a group folder.” As such, new independent claim 24 is patentably distinct from the prior art reference.

New Claims 23, 25

Claims 23 and 25 recite “in response to a search term query, providing search results of a list of public folders with information about one or more websites comprising the queried search term.” Support for the new claim can be found in the specification (See [paras. 0036, 0127]). *Brewster* does not disclose, teach or suggest providing search results from a search term query as claimed in claims 23 and 25. As such, claims 23 and 25 are patentably distinct from the prior art reference.

Claims 23 and 25 also depend from claim 1 and 24, respectively. Therefore, these claims are patentable for the same reasons advanced above with respect to their respective independent claims.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that all the claims remaining in the application are now in condition for allowance, and respectfully request that the application be passed to issue. Such relief, or in the alternative an Ex Parte Quayle Action is respectfully requested, and such relief hereby earnestly solicited.

Should any residual matters left to be resolved, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned agent at 949.732.6682 (office) at his convenience.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any required fee in connection with the submission of this paper, now or in the future, or credit any overpayment to Account No. 50-2638. Please ensure that Attorney Docket Number 104128-213401 is referred to when charging any payments or credits for this case.

Date: November 24, 2008

Respectfully submitted,



Ehab M. Samuel
Reg. No. 57,905

Customer Number 64494
GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP
1900 University Avenue, Fifth Floor
East Palo Alto, CA 94303
(949) 732-6682 Telephone
(310) 586-7800 Facsimile
email: laipmail@gtlaw.com